REMARKS

Entry of this Amendment and reconsideration are respectfully requested in view of the amendments made to the claims and for the remarks made herein.

Claims 1-9 are pending and stand rejected. Claims 1, 3, 6 and 7 have been amended.

Claims 1-4 and 6-8 stand rejected under 35 USC 102(e) as being anticipated by Wei, Gang ("TV Program Classification Based on Face and Text Processing").

Applicant respectfully disagrees with and explicitly traverses the reason for rejecting the claims. However, in the interest of advancing the prosecution of this matter, claims 1, 3, 6 and 7 have been amended. No new matter has been added. Support for the amendments to the independent claims 1 and 6 may be found at least in the subject matter recited in dependent claims 3 and 7.

Wei, Gang disclose a system to classify TV programs into predefined categories based on the analysis of their vide contents. This is useful in intelligent display. By applying face and text tracking to a number of training video segments including commercials, news, sitcoms and soaps, patterns are identified within each category of TV program in a predefined feature space that reflects the face and text characteristics of the video. (see Abstract). Wei, Gang discloses that with regard to text information, a "[n]umber (per unit time) and average duration of face and text trajectories are dimensions of this feature space. ... [F]aces and text with long duration or close shot size are important in recognizing TV programs. The faces and text trajectories are filtered by duration and shot size threshold. The number and average duration of the 'surviving' trajectories constitute additional dimensions in the feature space. In addition, the count and duration of face trajectories with faces larger than shoulder shots are also dimensions of the feature space." (see second paragraph, section 3.1).

Hence, Wei, Gang teaches a system wherein the duration of text (and face) information is used to determine the type of program. However, Wei, Gang fails to teach or suggest "comparing the time of occurrence of two cues selected from the at least one identified cues and determining a proximity of occurrence of the two selected cues and classifying the program based on the proximity of occurrence of the two selected cues, "

as is recited in the claims. Rather Wei, Gang classifies programs using the duration of the cue and the number of cues of known duration.

A claim is anticipated only if each and every element recited therein is expressly or inherently described in a single prior art reference. Wei, Gang cannot be said to anticipate the present invention, because Wei, Gang fails to disclose each and every element recited. As shown, Wei, Gang fails to determine a "classifying the program based on the proximity of occurrence of the two selected cues."

At least for this reason, applicant submits that the rejection of claim 1, for example, has been overcome and can no longer be sustained. Applicant respectfully requests withdrawal of the rejection and allowance of the claim.

With regard to the remaining independent claim 6, this claim recites subject matter similar to that recited in claim 1 and was rejected for the same reason used in rejecting claim 1. Thus, for the amendments made to this claim, which are similar to the amendments made with regard to claim 1, and for the remarks made in response to the rejection of claim 1, which are applicable in response to the rejection of this claim, and reasserted, as if in full, herein, applicant submits that the reason for rejecting claim 6 has been overcome and the rejection can no longer be sustained. Applicant respectfully requests withdrawal of the rejection and allowance of the claims.

With regard the remaining claims, these claims ultimately depend from the independent claims, which have been shown to contain subject matter not disclosed by, and, hence, allowable over, the reference cited. Accordingly, these claims are also allowable by virtue of their dependency from an allowable base claim.

Applicant respectfully requests withdrawal of the rejection and allowance of the claims.

For all the foregoing reasons, it is respectfully submitted that all the present claims are patentable in view of the cited references. A Notice of Allowance is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

Steven Petersen
Registration No. 31,287

Date: September 6, 2005

By: Steve Cha
Attorney for Applicant
Registration No. 44,069

Mail all correspondence to:
Steven Petersen, Registration No. 31,287
US PHILIPS CORPORATION
P.O. Box 3001
Briarcliff Manor, NY 10510-8001
Phone: (914) 333-9608
Fax: (914) 332-0615

<u>**Certificate of Mailing Under 37 CFR 1.8**</u>

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being deposited with the United States Postal Service as first class mail in an envelope addressed to MAIL STOP AMENDMENT, COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS, P.O. BOX 1450, ALEXANDRIA, VA. 22313 on September 6, 2005.

Steve Cha, Reg. No. 44,069
(Name of Registered Rep.)

(Signature and Date)